

June 4, 1992
47 South Lake Avenue, #4
Albany, New York 12203

Harold Weisberg
Route 12
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thanks for your letter of May 30, 1992.

I was not under the impression I was to personally return the materials, thus I apologize for my misperception. In any event, the legal materials were not taken from any files but rather were found alongside of the cabinets stacked together. The ONI file was taken from the O file I believe. Furthermore, I would not have been able to personally return the items until late fall at the very earliest. I assume you would have wished the materials to be returned sooner. However, in the future I will certainly personally return any items you allow me to borrow. I do apologize for any inconveniences caused on my part and I thank you once again for your generosity.

I am at a loss as to which specific document you are referring to with regards to the single bullet theory and the autopists. However, as you know, pages 374-376 of Volume II of the President's Commissions contains the testimony of Dr. Humes. He states quite frankly that "it is most unlikely" that CE399 caused all the wounds attributed to it by the Commission. Dr. Boswell did not comment upon CE399. However, Dr. Finck was very explicit when questioned (as described on page 382) about CE399. Finck replied "definitely not" when asked by Specter if CE399 could have caused Connally's wounds.

Is that what you were referring to in your letter? If not, please clarify for me the document you are seeking and if I am in possession of it, I will immediately forward you a copy. I have obtained a copy of the JAMA articles but thank you for your consideration. The press conference was never published by any of the newspapers or media outlets but I have included various newspaper articles and television transcripts relating to the story for your records. Please send me anything you compose on the subject.

As for my FBI file, I believe you are correct. It is my opinion that the redactions are protecting my professor's identity, if that is who reported me to the FBI. I was required to maintain a journal of my activities while

working for Parliament and there are many references relating to foreign policy contained in my remarks. It is possible that many of the (b)(1) exemptions are quotes from my journal and therefore relate to foreign policy and fall within that exception. If they published any of my own writings I would know who the source was.

I filed requests with both the Buffalo and New York offices of the FBI and was informed Buffalo maintained a file but New York did not. I have not yet heard from Washington regarding my appeal. However, my appeal for the Justice Department memorandum that you spoke to George Lardner about was denied. I will not proceed any further because I am already aware of a law suit pending regarding the same memorandum.

Graduation went well. I have started my job at the Mayor's Office and the bar review course. There is a lot of information to be memorized by the end of July, but I am confident I shall perform sufficiently enough to pass.

I am also beginning to further plan the writing of my book. So far four law students and three researchers have indicated they would assist with the research. We are meeting next week to discuss the project.

Some brief remarks concerning the JAMA article:

--It was very interesting to read that both Humes and Boswell had performed several autopsies each on gunshot victims, yet this is contrary to the information in print over the last 28 years. The extent of their true experience was left unexplained.

--When I interviewed Dr. Baden in 1989 he remarked that it was a substantial error not to have shaven the President's head. I have never seen this criticism in print before but Humes explains on page 2797 that there was no reason to do so since the wounds were so obvious.

--The remarks concerning Lt. Commander Pitzer were interesting (page 2798). What credentials did he need? Why was it proper to destroy the film?

--Humes still places the entrance wound lower than stated by the Clark panel. There was no explanation given as to the 10 cm discrepancy. In fact, there was no mention of it at all.

--I would like to know why Humes felt it would have been "criminal" to have excised the neck wound. I would think it would have been medically prudent to do so and proper.

--The refusal to discuss the President's adrenal glands is still unreasonable. Who is he protecting?

--The statement made by Humes that the Parkland doctors tried to place chest tubes in the president but did not pierce the pleura is still confusing (page 2798). Three doctors performed that procedure and it is a very simple one. I still do not understand how they could have failed.

--Humes blatantly lies when he states the drawings presented to the Warren Commission were "very accurate" (page 2800). He told Specter the opposite.

--Boswell accepts Dr. Lattimer's conjecture regarding the mislocation of the back wound in the autopsy chart by explaining the president's clothes had bunched up (page 2800). Still, six inches? The president's shirt was custom fitted and he had on a tight back brace as well as ace bandaging which would affect the mobility of both his shirt and jacket.

There is just too many other comments to make at this time but you are certainly aware of all the many discrepancies anyway. Those were some of the problems that leapt out at me while I skimmed the article.

By the way I might have a legitimate explanation for why the anterior x-ray does not accurately reflect the stare of death photograph. It is a technical medical explanation and I am pursuing it further. I will keep you informed.

Hope all is well. Please give my best to Lil. I look forward to your next letter. Here is to an enjoyable summer.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Mark S. Zaid', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark S. Zaid, J.D.